

from the dead. Think of his boldly telling them that as far as I was able to judge, he ~~was~~ was not a glorified spirit. Brothers, says he, I do not think I have yet laid down the tabernacle of flesh; or if I have, I do not suppose I have put on the robes of immortality. When you see me, do not think you see a ghost, for I am not one yet. Though pressing on to be one as far as I can, I have no doubt that Paul held in his eye the Scripture's raising up Christ from the dead, (see Acts 2: 24, 32. 3: 15, 26. Romans, 1: 4, 26,) and not simply that idea, but that, con- sidered as evidence of his, (Christ's) lordship - a seal set upon him by the Father of perfect approbation as having finished the work given him to do, and worthy to reign at his side. Paul set his mark the attainment of that same approbation <sup>to be</sup> in a similar manner. He says he had not reached the mark. What does that mean? That he was not yet raised from the dead. Nonsense. But that he was not yet a fit person on whom God could bestow such a mark of approbation, and strive to render himself such. Do we hear of Jesus pressing towards that mark. Can such words be

26

Rev. A. A. Phelps

Boston

Mass.

pressing, striving, be properly applied to the even course of a perfect person. Christ says he walks with a day or two, and then is perfected. But he does not say, "I press towards the mark, lest I should come short of it." Thus I have done in rather discursively, than in the outline form because it was easier. I may write you more fully on other points and papers. I am very truly yours J. P. Loveless



After the captivity, we were cleansed from their idols. I hope, I am well satisfied that the promises of the New Covenant of which so much is said, are to be taken as having an a German reference to the Jews after the captivity, and an incipient fulfillment among them. Religion had its ups and downs among them: yet on the whole, they kept the Covenant recorded in Ex. 24; See also 24; and the day was drawing, which did not indeed shine, until the actual coming, on the full, until the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ.

They say, before Christ is promised in the New Book; or, the New Book is the causing perfect holiness; and this is promised now, but not under the Mosaic Dispensation. What reason for thinking that Christians became perfectly sanctified, before death, now, when good people die not under Mosaic? They will say, light & dreams are greater. But it is duty in the same position; and the question returns, What reason for thinking that good men now will, in so better measure than their higher privileges, to the fulfillment perfect of their propagation of higher duties, than the ancient saints did theirs. The only two that have ever escaped death & this testimony that they fully pleased God lived under the old economy, not under the full Gospel light. But this is not exactly to the point for which I began this paragraph.

They say, God promises to and by; therefore we ought to expect to and by, i.e. entire sanctification short of death. If He has promised it absolutely to me, I will expect it, I will expect by thing I desire, and see good reason to think will happen, and nothing else can I expect. But no such absolute promise exists, as there is an absolute promise that God will carry on the good work he has begun in his people till the day of Christ. Indeed, they only alledge a conditional promise; if you will believe and apply the promise, I will make you perfectly holy. The question now arises, What is that particular exercise or act of faith, on which God then conditions the bestowment, as they call it, of perfect holiness? Wherein does it differ from perfect holiness itself? It must of course be holiness in its nature; But Mr. S. is not Mr. M., makes all holy exercises perfect in their very nature, like Communion, (only practicing what Communion taught as them,) Can say next, Fasting, or least, makes God promise perfect holiness on condition of perfect holiness. But setting aside this: They say, that, on condition of a certain exercise of faith, God promises perfect holiness, and I ought to expect the latter. How am I to know that I shall perform the required condition, since it must be of the nature of holiness, and to know that I shall hereafter perform any holy act, I must know that God will work in me to will and do it. How then can I know that I shall believe as required; and if I do not know I shall, how expect what is said to be promised on that condition? If they say, even can make certain to me my future fulfillment of the condition, I reply again, he cannot, without an absolute promise to me, make me certain that I shall exercise the given act of faith within a period, which period is also short of death.

The promise of the New Book is in my opinion, very respect what God has done & is doing for the renovation of Man, since the restoration of the Jews from the captivity - which, with some exceptions, is more and more full of today. Phil. 3:12-14. Simple resurrection from the dead cannot be the promise; else Paul commits the enormous absurdity of telling the Phil. specimens, that to be sure, he did not think himself already risen.

Mr. Henry is getting a better as to perfect holiness; says both a long, publicly at about 11-12, though not appearing in any of his sermons; from but opposing by any means.



No question is more important with relation to the N. Covenant, or will be debated with greater earnestness in this controversy, than the extent of the import of its language. Now, M. & S. say it must be taken like the same language in the Law, else we make the Jew, Quire, of God's grace & bounty, compared with the requisitions of his justice, (Qu. authority, by) But God's grace, in its actual exercise among men, falls vastly short of the requisition of his authority. See does not excuse all he requires, and of course those intended to do it, yet this does not limit his good new grace. They would doubtless also insist, much on the argument from the new language, i.e. from the similarity of the phraseology used in giving Law, as in Deut. to that employed in the promise of the New Covenant. This argument would be strong if the new language were to be gathered only from the Law. But we happen to find a great deal of language similar to that of the New Covenant used in the Bible, and particularly in the Old Testament, by pious men, of themselves, and of others, and in many of these instances, we have undeniable evidence that it is to be limited. See particularly the 119th Psalm, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.



ness, & the New from saying it. &c. A Law requiring a covenant engaged.  
Instead of contrasting the Old & New Covenants, I took on the former as  
introducing to the latter, and embracing a part of the genius of the  
Gospel, as was possible in its time. It had a shadow of good things  
to come, but not the very image of the things. It was a pattern of things  
in the heaven, i.e. heavenly, or excellent things; but not the very  
heavenly things themselves. Of course, after Christ being come,  
an high priest of good things to come, it is now a very different  
matter to stick to the old covenant, and mould one's religion according  
to it, and worship God in its ritual, from what it was before the  
Substance had appeared. What was before the proper manifesta-  
tion of faith in a future Saviour, now became the proper expres-  
sion of unbelief in the time one, who had already come, i.e. Jesus.  
Hence the Apostles take their converts to task for cleaving to the  
Law, not meaning of course, the Moral Law, summarily com-  
pended in love to God & the neighbor, which it was their & Christ's  
great object to secure; but those things, and forms of the old di-  
spensation, which were being only to foreshadow Christ, & the nature of his  
Kingdom, were necessary of no service, and worse than that, often  
his advers. A religion of types and shadows was the one time re-  
ligion, till Christianity had fully arrived; after that, it was injurious  
and disobedient to grow by the light of the Sun, on the other  
side of the world from the first luminary. So Paul to the Galatians;  
where he is far from objecting them because they loved God  
and their neighbor too well. The Law requiring those things, he  
seems not to have in his eye, except in one or two instances.  
It is the system of foreshadowing forms, &c. which he blames  
them for clinging to, after the very persons & dispensation, so  
foreshadowed, had arrived and were in full authority. This is what  
Paul there calls the Law. He speaks of the covenant from Sinai  
leading to bondage, indeed; but he means, that persons took under it  
were born to the observance of a burdensome ritual, which it was cer-  
tainly their duty to observe while its authority lasted; and further, and  
especially, that, under the Ch. dispensation, when he, Paul, was writ-  
ing, that ritual would verify, if any one aspired to keep it, instead of  
coming into the liberty of Christ, bring him into a bondage penitential to  
his soul. For it would then be a substitution of the shadows of Christ  
for Christ himself; and no matter how bright that shadow, how  
now even adapted to its purpose, as a shadow is at its best,  
and perfect in its representation, still it could be only the opening  
of unbelief to prosper in to Christ. I think it the key that unlocks  
the apostle to the Galatians. See particularly ch. 3: 23, 24, 25. The  
Apostle might have argued, from the ritual Law's foreshadowing Christ,  
that it could not disannul, or depreciate him, as well as from  
the priority in time of the giving of the promise to the giving of the  
Law, See ch. 3: 17.



which respect the coming of Christ himself, the pouring out of the  
Spirit on all flesh, and then lengthening her cords, enlarging her borders,  
was clearing, &c. which are more or less conditional, properly speaking.  
I mean not that human agency must not be concerned in the accom-  
plishment of the thing, promised, but that promise fully in place  
that God, who knows what he can wisely and well do, will be-  
come all the human instrumentality and co-operation necessary  
to bring to pass what he says. I have no doubt of their principle be-  
ing correct. Under the Old Covenant God never pledged himself, in  
the manner absolutely, that the Jewish nation should be really  
his own people in the benign sense. He knew he could not wisely, &  
thence not accomplish it. He put them under a dispensation, em-  
bodying not only a law, common to all dispensations, after coming, and  
worlds, but a ritual, foreshadowing things to come, and of those things,  
chiefly, Christ as a sacrifice for sin. He declared himself, moreover,  
the Lord God, merciful & gracious, forgiving iniquity, & which suffi-  
ciently marks the Mosaic as only another form of the Christian dis-  
pensation. He gave the Spirit with all this truth, to make an an-  
ticipated favor effectual to the salvation of sinners. Yet, God could  
not, and did not pledge himself to make the Jews as such avail  
themselves of their privileges. The tenor of his language to them  
was, and could only be, If you will be my people, I will be your  
God. But he never absolutely promised that he would be so  
or influence enough to make them so, as a people. Some promise  
he gave them, which are to be considered absolute, because they im-  
ply a pledge as God's part, that he would secure the fulfillment  
of the necessary condition on their part by some generation of the  
people on earth; once on the promise to give them the land of  
Canaan for an inheritance. Each generation, it is true, that had the  
opportunity to enter in, must exercise its free agency whether to enter  
in or not. But God was pledged to prevail on some one freely  
to enter in; yet not pledged to keep them free from idolatry,  
in any one generation, as he could and did pledge himself with  
regard to Jews after the captivity, and redeemed it. In short, it  
was not God's full purpose but only his desire to do for the world,  
and for the Jews in particular, under Moses, what he fully meant to do,  
under Christ. Not to do for the Jews before, what he fully meant to  
do for them after the captivity. Of course he could not, in the  
former cases, absolutely promise what he could in the latter.

You will see that I by no means contrast the old & new  
Covenants, as Mr. M. & S. do. There is a difference indeed as above. But  
they have accustomed themselves to contrast them, just as we do,  
sometimes, the Law & Gospel; and indeed they appear to think  
that these things correspond and are the same with the other.  
Hence they speak of the old covenants requiring perfect works.



2

pardon; and it was further fully implied that if the transgressor should exercise implicit faith in God's placability as a moral governor his sins should in every respect be forgiven. You see then that I do not regard the old covenant as being in any sense whatever the throne of a governor concerning the conduct of his subjects. The moral law is a standing & unalterable expression of God's will concerning the conduct of moral beings; the same to Adam to Abraham to Israel & to us. Dispensation cannot in any wise affect it either in precept or penalty. Covenants or engagements may pass away being adapted to occasional exigencies. I know of nothing that marks the incipient stage of perfectionism more strongly than a disposition to sail at the old covenant, especially when it is identified in any sense with the moral law; for it is then inevitable that the ideas & associations connected with the old covenant should pass on & attach to the moral law itself and this once done all is gone.

The old covenant was just as good as the times & the people to whom it was given admitted. Infinite wisdom saw that a present difference between the old & new covenants has no respect whatever to the moral law in itself considered, or indeed any law considered. Under the old God engaged or covenanted to be a God to the Jews, if they would be his people, and under a large variety of influences to make them continue his people; but under the new, he uses a far greater variety still, gives a Savior to be believed in, as already promised, and adds more of the Spirit, since then is more power for him to apply, and so can well have promised, as he did, that, comparatively speaking, he would write his laws in the minds of his church under the new dispensation, so that they should not forget him. The New Covenant is God's engagement that he would do what he has done, is doing, and is to do for the church; and in it, in respect particularly to its rising and its spread, which last is often the theme of Isaiah, from the 40th ch. to the close. This engagement was absolute, with the church in general, the apparent condition in Ezek. 34, being a part of the promise itself, as will be seen by comparing the expression, "I will yet be inquired of, &c." with the same in Ezek. 34:3, & 20:3, 31. The meaning of it in ~~the~~ these instances ~~shall~~ is, The time shall yet come, when I will be entreated, prevailed on, by the house of Israel, to do this thing for them. The original word translated yet, is an adverb of time, and never in a single instance means not-with-standing, as in condition. Look on the promise of the New Covenant, therefore, as unconditional with respect to the church at large, and range it alongside with those



on this subject almost without end, and seem to feel that every thing depends not only on fearing God but on eschewing these abominable necessities. Mr. Finney said yesterday that in one sense it was as bad to use them as to use alcohol, to wit that if a person knew it was wrong & yet did it it was just as much sin. Now this makes it equally bad in any respect, I do not see but he said so. The first half his sermon was solemn & instructive; the last half was or third was the old tirade. As to me, I use it & am for permitting others who like it to use it too, and would have every body his own judge in this particular & the same with regard to the common condiments in the families of farmers. The trustees & their prudential Committee act as if they meant to stake every thing in ~~agreed~~ enforcing Grahamism, in regard to meats & condiments. To this I am totally opposed, as you will see from my fourth letter. My diet has always been of choice exceedingly plain & simple. I should not find fault with breakfast & supper of a bowl of bread & milk the year round, but I have been determined that the students should not be humbugged into a diseased conscientiousness on this subject.

Concerning the covenant, I must needs give but an outline of my views, but hope to publish them more at large by and by, perhaps in the Biblical Repository. A covenant is an agreement or engagement <sup>between two parties</sup> I suppose. This is its only proper sense. It may be used figuratively, like almost any other word, but no doctrine ought to be or can be based on a figurative use of the word. The expression, "Tables of the Covenant," I suppose to be figurative. There is an ellipsis; and the meaning is, the tables of the Law <sup>which</sup> God gave, and obedience to which was the condition binding <sup>the party</sup> to the fulfillment of the engagement or covenant on his part. So the people, "He wrote on the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." "The ten commandments," is in apposition not to "covenant" but to "words," and is the same term indeed in the original. The word of the covenant, the ten words, is the original; words then meaning precepts or laws. Law of the covenant, then, is the meaning of the whole; and the ten commandments are so called not because a law or commandment can be a covenant but because as above, obedience to them was the prime condition of the covenant required by God and promised by the people. I say prime condition for perfect obedience to the moral law or ten commandments was not the only condition of God's covenant with Israel. A part of the covenant or engagement was, that if they should at any time transgress in ways & manners supposed they should then offer specific sacrifices as atonements for sin & iniquity. Whereupon God promised that as their guilt could be washed



Pres. Mahan, as heard from two or three days ago, had been to  
York, and for a short time, Brunswick, to visit his wife's sister, Dr. Mrs.  
Phon, promising his intention for the winter. The "News from Orem"  
in Exeter paper is correctly correct. Orem Dec 9 1849  
The date, being over a year ago last summer. The writer of the article  
never meant. Dear Bro. Phelps. It is for the public eye. J. P. Cowles

I received yours of Nov. 26, last Saturday.  
He mean here, by "the union of the sexes" their joint education. It is not  
matrimonial union, though union of that sort sometimes take place  
here, which I have wished were consummated elsewhere. There have  
been four instances during the last season of couples getting married  
here, who had finished a part education they were going to get, and  
instead of going to friends or parents, or all might be married they chose  
to perpetuate it here, and did. In two cases, the couples went directly  
home, and intended to do so before the ceremony took place, to do so. I have  
added, I suppose, to my sin, by opposing such things, as injudicious and  
improper.

Upon referring again to your letter I find your question respects  
the "precise difference" between me & the brethren here with respect to  
the union of the sexes. I have never been in favor of mixing them  
in a collegiate and theological institutions; and if they were mixed  
as here that I have thought that at least it should be to a limited extent  
& by no means in every study & exercise. I have thought that young  
ladies accustomed to read compositions before considerable classes of  
young men were on the high road to Abby Melanism, or perhaps  
something worse than she is for I do not know from personal acquaintance  
that she is masculine. Pres. Mahan in particular is disposed to push  
mixing the sexes in this exercise, and would will might annihilate the fe-  
male department as a distinct one from the others. Nor do I think it  
desirable that young ladies should take a college course rather than  
that laid down for them. The last I think best adapted to its professed  
purpose. Besides the familiarity which such constant intercourse with  
young men breeds in the other sex, manifested by brothering them just as  
you would brother me and in other ways is revolting to my taste. I have  
always fully expressed my opposition to this feature of the institution  
though I have always admitted that it operated as well here as it could be  
expected to do any where, & have often silenced opposers to it. E. by showing that  
the same feature marks N. E. academies generally. Still it has its evils ev-  
ery where. Many of both sex are evidently much taken up with each other, spend  
much of their time in visiting, &c.

As to dietetics, I use neither tea nor coffee but am totally opposed to  
the use of these drinks being denominated as universally in, in those who have been placed  
on the subject. Pres. Mahan & Gen. A., especially the latter, have been